

Todd M. Friedman (SBN 216752)  
Adrian R. Bacon (SBN 280332)  
Thomas E. Wheeler (SBN 308789)  
LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.  
21550 Oxnard St., Suite 780  
Woodland Hills, CA 91367  
Phone: (323) 306-4234  
Fax: (866) 633-0228  
tfriedman@toddfllaw.com  
abacon@toddfllaw.com  
twheeler@toddfllaw.com  
Attorneys for Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

<b>SIDNEY NAIMAN</b> , individually and	)	Case No.
on behalf of all others similarly	)	
situated,	)	<b><u>CLASS ACTION</u></b>
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<b>COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS</b>
	)	<b>OF:</b>
vs.	)	
	)	1. NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF
	)	THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER
	)	PROTECTION ACT [47 U.S.C.
<b>GLOBAL ATLANTIC FINANCIAL</b>	)	§227 ET SEQ.]
<b>COMPANY</b> , and DOES 1 through 10,	)	2. WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE
inclusive, and each of them,	)	TELEPHONE CONSUMER
	)	PROTECTION ACT [47 U.S.C.
	)	§227 ET SEQ.]
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	<b>DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL</b>

Plaintiff, SIDNEY NAIMAN (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, alleges the following upon information and belief based upon personal knowledge:

## NATURE OF THE CASE

1. Plaintiff brings this action for himself and others similarly situated seeking damages and any other available legal or equitable remedies resulting from

the illegal actions of GLOBAL ATLANTIC FINANCIAL COMPANY (“Defendant”), in negligently, knowingly, and/or willfully contacting Plaintiff on Plaintiff’s cellular telephone in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 *et seq.* (“TCPA”), thereby invading Plaintiff’s privacy.

### **JURISDICTION & VENUE**

2. Jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2) because Plaintiff, a resident of California, seeks relief on behalf of a Class, which will result in at least one class member belonging to a different state than that of Defendant, a Delaware corporation. Plaintiff also seeks up to \$1,500.00 in damages for each call in violation of the TCPA, which, when aggregated among a proposed class in the thousands, exceeds the \$5,000,000.00 threshold for federal court jurisdiction. Therefore, both diversity jurisdiction and the damages threshold under the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 (“CAFA”) are present, and this Court has jurisdiction.

3. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) because Defendant does business within the state of California and Plaintiff resides within this District.

### **PARTIES**

4. Plaintiff, SIDNEY NAIMAN (“Plaintiff”), is a natural person residing in Contra Costa County, California and is a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).

5. Defendant, GLOBAL ATLANTIC FINANCIAL COMPANY (“Defendant” or “DEFENDANT”), is an insurance company, and is a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).

6. The above named Defendant, and its subsidiaries and agents, are collectively referred to as “Defendants.” The true names and capacities of the Defendants sued herein as DOE DEFENDANTS 1 through 10, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues such Defendants by fictitious names. Each of the Defendants designated herein as a DOE is legally responsible

1 for the unlawful acts alleged herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of Court to amend the  
2 Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the DOE Defendants when  
3 such identities become known.

4 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes that at all relevant times, each and  
5 every Defendant was acting as an agent and/or employee of each of the other  
6 Defendants and was acting within the course and scope of said agency and/or  
7 employment with the full knowledge and consent of each of the other Defendants.  
8 Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the acts and/or omissions complained  
9 of herein was made known to, and ratified by, each of the other Defendants.

10 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

11 8. Beginning on or around May 6, 2019, Defendant contacted Plaintiff  
12 on his cellular telephone ending in -6535, in an effort to sell or solicit its services.

13 9. Defendant called Plaintiff on his cellular telephone from the following  
14 phone number confirmed to belong to Defendant, (619) 720-3886.

15 10. Defendant used an “automatic telephone dialing system”, as defined  
16 by 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1) to place its calls to Plaintiff seeking to sell or solicit its  
17 business services.

18 11. Defendant’s calls constituted calls that were not for emergency  
19 purposes as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).

20 12. Defendant’s calls were placed to telephone number assigned to a  
21 cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs a charge for incoming calls  
22 pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

23 13. Plaintiff is not a customer of Defendant’s services and has never  
24 provided any personal information, including his cellular telephone number, to  
25 Defendant for any purpose whatsoever.

26 14. Defendant never received Plaintiff’s “prior express consent” to  
27 receive calls using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or  
28 prerecorded voice on his cellular telephone pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).

1           15. Plaintiff alleges upon information and belief, including without  
2 limitation his experiences as recounted herein, especially his experience of being  
3 called despite Defendant's lack of express consent to call him, that Defendant lacks  
4 reasonable policies and procedures to avoid the violations of the Telephone  
5 Consumer Protection act herein described.

6                                   **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

7           16. Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of all others  
8 similarly situated, as a member the proposed class (hereafter, "The Class") defined  
9 as follows:

10                               All persons within the United States who received any  
11 solicitation/telemarketing telephone calls from  
12 Defendant to said person's cellular telephone made  
13 through the use of any automatic telephone dialing  
14 system or an artificial or prerecorded voice and such  
15 person had not previously consented to receiving such  
16 calls within the four years prior to the filing of this  
17 Complaint

17           17. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of, The Class, consisting of all  
18 persons within the United States who received any solicitation telephone calls from  
19 Defendant to said person's cellular telephone made through the use of any  
20 automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice and such  
21 person had not previously not provided their cellular telephone number to  
22 Defendant within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

23           18. Defendant, its employees and agents are excluded from The Class.  
24 Plaintiff does not know the number of members in The Class, but believes the Class  
25 members number in the thousands, if not more. Thus, this matter should be  
26 certified as a Class Action to assist in the expeditious litigation of the matter.

27           19. The Class is so numerous that the individual joinder of all of its  
28 members is impractical. While the exact number and identities of The Class

1 members are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and can only be ascertained through  
2 appropriate discovery, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that  
3 The Class includes thousands of members. Plaintiff alleges that The Class  
4 members may be ascertained by the records maintained by Defendant.

5 20. Plaintiff and members of The Class were harmed by the acts of  
6 Defendant in at least the following ways: Defendant illegally contacted Plaintiff  
7 and The Class members via their cellular telephones thereby causing Plaintiff and  
8 The Class members to incur certain charges or reduced telephone time for which  
9 Plaintiff and The Class members had previously paid by having to retrieve or  
10 administer messages left by Defendant during those illegal calls, and invading the  
11 privacy of said Plaintiff and The Class members.

12 21. Common questions of fact and law exist as to all members of The  
13 Class which predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of  
14 The Class. These common legal and factual questions, which do not vary between  
15 Class members, and which may be determined without reference to the individual  
16 circumstances of any Class members, include, but are not limited to, the following:

- 17 a. Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this  
18 Complaint, Defendant made any telemarketing/solicitation call  
19 (other than a call made for emergency purposes or made with  
20 the prior express consent of the called party) to a Class member  
21 using any automatic telephone dialing system or any artificial  
22 or prerecorded voice to any telephone number assigned to a  
23 cellular telephone service;
- 24 b. Whether Plaintiff and the Class members were damaged  
25 thereby, and the extent of damages for such violation; and
- 26 c. Whether Defendant should be enjoined from engaging in such  
27 conduct in the future.

28 22. As a person that received numerous telemarketing/solicitation calls

1 from Defendant using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or  
2 prerecorded voice, without Plaintiff's prior express consent, Plaintiff is asserting  
3 claims that are typical of The Class.

4 23. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members  
5 of The Class. Plaintiff has retained attorneys experienced in the prosecution of  
6 class actions.

7 24. A class action is superior to other available methods of fair and  
8 efficient adjudication of this controversy, since individual litigation of the claims  
9 of all Class members is impracticable. Even if every Class member could afford  
10 individual litigation, the court system could not. It would be unduly burdensome  
11 to the courts in which individual litigation of numerous issues would proceed.  
12 Individualized litigation would also present the potential for varying, inconsistent,  
13 or contradictory judgments and would magnify the delay and expense to all parties  
14 and to the court system resulting from multiple trials of the same complex factual  
15 issues. By contrast, the conduct of this action as a class action presents fewer  
16 management difficulties, conserves the resources of the parties and of the court  
17 system, and protects the rights of each Class member.

18 25. The prosecution of separate actions by individual Class members  
19 would create a risk of adjudications with respect to them that would, as a practical  
20 matter, be dispositive of the interests of the other Class members not parties to such  
21 adjudications or that would substantially impair or impede the ability of such non-  
22 party Class members to protect their interests.

23 26. Defendant has acted or refused to act in respects generally applicable  
24 to The Class, thereby making appropriate final and injunctive relief with regard to  
25 the members of the Class as a whole.

26 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

27 **Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act**

28 **47 U.S.C. §227 et seq.**

1        27. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of  
2 action the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-26.

3        28. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous  
4 and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each  
5 and every one of the above cited provisions of *47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.*

6        29. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of *47 U.S.C. § 227 et*  
7 *seq.*, Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled an award of \$500.00 in statutory  
8 damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to *47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B)*.

9        30. Plaintiff and the Class members are also entitled to and seek  
10 injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

11                    **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

12        **Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act**  
13                    ***47 U.S.C. §227 et seq.***

14        31. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of  
15 action the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-26.

16        32. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous  
17 and multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not  
18 limited to each and every one of the above cited provisions of *47 U.S.C. § 227 et*  
19 *seq.*

20        33. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of *47*  
21 *U.S.C. § 227 et seq.*, Plaintiff and the Class members are entitled an award of  
22 \$1,500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to *47 U.S.C.*  
23 *§ 227(b)(3)(B)* and *47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C)*.

24        34. Plaintiff and the Class members are also entitled to and seek  
25 injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

26        ///

27        ///

28        ///



**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests judgment against Defendant for the following:

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

**Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act**

**47 U.S.C. §227 et seq.**

- As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1), Plaintiff and the Class members are entitled to and request \$500 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 227(b)(3)(B); and
- Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

**Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act**

**47 U.S.C. §227 et seq.**

- As a result of Defendant's willful and/or knowing violations of 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1), Plaintiff and the Class members are entitled to and request treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3)(C); and
- Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

**JURY DEMAND**

35. Pursuant to his rights under the Seventh Amendment to the United States Constitution, Plaintiff demands a jury on all issues so triable.

Respectfully Submitted this 8th day of June, 2021.

LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.

By: /s/ Todd M. Friedman

Todd M. Friedman

Law Offices of Todd M. Friedman

Attorney for Plaintiff